



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

11-A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,963	09/22/2006	Gert Fuhrmann	7347-000011/US/NP	5714
27572	7590	11/02/2007	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			DUBNOW, JOSHUA M	
P.O. BOX 828			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			2861	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/02/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/593,963	FUHRMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joshua M. Dubnow	2861	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ ..
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/22/2006. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The limitation of "the withdrawn documents" lacks proper antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Brooks et al. (U.S. Publication # 2002/0181007)**.

Considering **claim 1**, Brooks et al. discloses an information terminal with a housing (Figure 2), display screen (paragraph 0036), input apparatus (100), printing unit (132) for printing documents, output apparatus (114) for outputting documents, and a return tray (holding bin, paragraph 0041) for storing documents which are not removed from the output apparatus. The return tray has an associated module for rendering illegible the information which is printed on the withdrawn documents (paragraphs 0034, 0041).

Considering **claim 3**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Brooks et al. discloses that the module is in the form of a printing device for completely or partially blacking out the documents (paragraph 0034).

Considering **claim 5**, and as applied to claim 3 above, Brooks et al. discloses that the printing device used is a thermal printing line (paragraphs 0029, 0040).

Considering **claim 7**, and as applied to claim 1, Brooks et al. discloses that paper is input into the printer from a paper tray (200). Because sheets are printed on individually, they are separated from a bundle of sheets before the printing process occurs (Figure 4).

Considering **claim 8**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Brooks et al. discloses that the module is actuated and activated only when the documents contain sensitive data (paragraph 0030).

Considering **claim 9**, Brooks et al. discloses a printing unit for printing and supplying documents comprising a document feed means (122, 124), a transporting roller (102), a printing station (132), an output apparatus (114), and a return tray (holding bin) for storing documents which are not removed from the output apparatus (paragraph 0041). The return tray has an associated module for rendering illegible the information which is printed on the withdrawn documents (paragraphs 0034, 0041).

Considering **claim 11**, and as applied to claim 8 above, Brooks et al. discloses that the module is in the form of a printing device for completely or partially blacking out the documents (paragraph 0034).

Considering **claim 16**, and as applied to claim 8, Brooks et al. discloses that paper is input into the printer from a paper tray (200). Because sheets are printed on individually, they are separated from a bundle of sheets before the printing process occurs (Figure 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 4, 10, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Brooks et al. (U.S. Publication # 2002/0181007)**.

Considering **claim 2** and **claim 10**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Brooks et al. discloses a printing unit comprising all of the claimed limitations discussed above.

While Brooks et al. does not explicitly disclose that the module is in the form of a shredding apparatus, Brooks et al. discloses that the print sheet is destroyed by perforation (paragraph 0034).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the printing unit to shred the print sheets so that they are completely destroyed and any sensitive material is rendered unreadable. Furthermore, the limitation of a shredding apparatus in a printing device is well known in the art.

Considering **claim 4** and **claim 12**, Brooks et al. does not explicitly disclose that the printing device uses colored ink. However, the use of colored ink is well known in the field. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the printing device to use colored ink in order to print the information in a more clear and appealing manner.

Considering **claim 13**, and as applied to claim 10 above, Brooks et al. discloses that the printing device used is a thermal printing line (paragraphs 0029, 0040).

6. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Brooks et al. (U.S. Publication # 2002/0181007)** in view of **Speich (U.S. Patent # 7,029,111)**.

Considering **claim 6** and **claim 14**, Brooks et al. discloses a printing unit comprising all of the claimed limitations discussed above.

Brooks et al. fails to explicitly disclose that the thermal printing device used is a fixing station.

However, Speich teaches a printing device comprising a fixing station (20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the printing device of Brooks et al. with the teaching of Speich to include a fixing station in order to better form the printed information or image onto the print medium leading to higher quality printing.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Brooks et al. (U.S. Publication # 2002/0181007)** in view of **Heinz (DE 19916196)**.

Considering **claim 15**, and as applied to claim 8 above, Brooks et al. discloses a printing unit comprising all of the claimed limitations discussed above.

Brooks et al. fails to disclose that a collection drum is provided for forming a bundle of documents.

However, Heinz teaches a device for gathering sheets with a drum (5) for forming a stack of the sheets (abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the printing unit of Brooks et al. with the teaching of Heinz in order to reliably stack and bundle a group of sheets together to save space.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua M. Dubnow whose telephone number is 571-270-1337. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Luu can be reached on 571-272-7663. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



MATTHEW LUU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



Joshua M Dubnow
Examiner
Art Unit 2861

October 23, 2007